DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 067 775 88 EA 004 633

AUTHOR	Gibboney, Richard A.; Langsdorf, Michael G.
TITLE	Final Evaluation Report for the Alternative Schools Project 1971-72.
INSTITUTION	Pennsylvania Univ., Philadelphia. Graduate School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jul 72
NOTE	80p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Performance; *Alternative Schools; Community Attitudes; Decision Making; Discovery Learning; *Educational Experiments; *Educational Objectives; Humanization; Open Education; *Program Attitudes; *Program Evaluation; Self Actualization; Student Attitudes; Student Centered Curriculum; Student Participation; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS	*Alternative Schools Project; Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III

ABSTRACT

This report presents data pertaining to 13 different project objectives grouped by student, teacher, and community objectives. Student objectives covered self-initiated learning, competency in verbal and math skills, attitudes toward the alternative school, involvement in decisionmaking, community involvement, evaluation, self image, and students functioning as teachers. Teacher objectives were a positive alternative school attitude, use of a variety of teaching methods and materials, participation in decisionmaking, and frequent evaluation of administration. The community objective called for the community to have a positive attitude toward the alternative school. For each objective, the report describes the method of data collection, the data, the procedure used to analyze the data, and the conclusions drawn. The final section of the report on student attitudes compares the attitudes toward school of the alternative school students with those of a comparison group. (Author/DN)

ED 067775

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

for the

ALTERNATIVE SCHOOLS PROJECT

1971-72

(TITLE III ESEA)

By

RICHARD A. GIBBONEY

MICHAEL G. LANGSDORF

EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CENTER

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA

JULY 1972

EA 004 633

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction	
Part I--Student Objectives	3
Objective 1	3
Objective 2	12
Objective 3	14
Objective 4	17
Objective 5	19
Objective 6	21
Objective 7	26
Objective 8	28
Additional Student Data	29
Part II--Teacher Objectives	36
Introduction	36
Objective 1	37
Objective 2	40
Objective 3	46
Objective 4	49
Additional Data on Teachers	51
Part III--Community Objectives	61
Part IV--Student Attitudes Toward the Alternative School	66
Part V--Major Conclusions and Recommendations	74

INTRODUCTION

This is the second of two formal evaluation reports prepared by the Educational Development Center at the University of Pennsylvania for the Alternative Schools Project. The first of these reports, entitled the Interim Evaluation Report, was submitted in April, 1972, to serve two primary functions: to present preliminary data relating to several selected objectives of the Project and to delineate and describe several of the more salient process characteristics of the Project as they had developed over time. The primary purpose of this report, however, is to present the data pertaining to the selected Project objectives as stated in the Addendum to the Formal Project Proposal of August 2, 1971.

Because this report will attempt to assess the success of the Project in attaining its objectives, the thrust will be largely summative in nature. That is, the evaluators will be looking at the past year as a fait accompli and will be concerned not so much with program modification as with final judgments on the success of the first year's operation of the Project.

This report will present data pertaining to 13 different objectives grouped as follows: 8 student objectives; 4 teacher objectives; and 1 community objective. Since the student objectives will be presented first, a description of the data collection procedure as it relates to these objectives is appropriate at this point.

With the exception of Objective 1, concerning the development of cognitive skills, all of the student objectives were assessed through a comprehensive, parallel interview procedure in each school. For these interviews, the evaluators selected a random, stratified sample, constituted of twenty percent of the students at each school. The samples were stratified by race, and also by a handicapped/non-handicapped classification as defined by the sending school.

The total student sample consists of 54 students, across both schools; 31 from the East Unit, and 23 from the West Unit. The Interim Evaluation Report indicated that all students in the sample were assigned to mutually exclusive groups corresponding to school unit, race, and whether or not they were handicapped. This report will forego most of these categorizations because the Interim Report indicated virtually no significant differences among the various sub-groups. This report will consider the sample from each school as autonomous groups and will measure differences only between the East Unit and the West Unit, as they were reflected in each of the three cycles of interviews.

The first cycle of student interviews occurred during October and November, 1971, the second in January, 1972, and the third in May, 1972. Data from each cycle were first categorized by frequency according to the East and West Unit classifications. Following this, percentages and overall modal responses were studied to ascertain what differences, if any, inspection revealed between the two schools. Finally, the data were analyzed, using a Chi square test, to determine if there were significant statistical differences between the schools.

The remainder of this report will consist of 4 major sections. Section I will present data and conclusions pertaining to the 8 student objectives. Section II will present data on the 4 teacher objectives; Section III, on the 1 community objective and Section IV on the attitudes toward school of the alternative school students and a comparison group.

In most instances data relating to the program objective will be presented as follows:

1. The objective will be stated.
2. The data collection and analysis procedures will be described, and, finally,
3. The data will be presented and conclusions drawn.

PART I

STUDENT OBJECTIVES

OBJECTIVE 1. "ALL STUDENTS WILL ACHIEVE AT OR BEYOND THE SCORES ON THE STANDARDIZED TESTS USED TO MEASURE BASIC COMPETENCIES IN THE AREAS OF VERBAL USAGE AND COMPREHENSION AND MATHEMATICS AS A COMPARABLE GROUP IN THE SENDING SCHOOLS."

In order to assess this objective, standardized tests were administered during April in 1972.

Two subtests, Reading and Mathematics were selected from the high school battery of the Stanford Achievement Test, Form W, as being appropriate for the testing session. The Reading subtest has 65 multiple-choice questions and is given in one 40 minute session. The manual provides the following description of the subtest's content: "The Reading Test consists of paragraphs of increasing length from a half dozen lines to paragraphs of nearly forty lines. Multiple-choice questions are then used to measure the comprehension of the paragraph. The questions are designed to test the ability to comprehend what is explicit in the material, to judge what is implied, and to draw inferences with reference to other situations."

The measurement of mathematics skills used in this evaluation was obtained from the administration of the Mathematics subtest of the Stanford. Part A of this two-part subtest contains 40 items "emphasizing elementary algebra and geometry as normally taught in grades 9 and 10." The 34 items in Part B cover "more advanced instruction in third and fourth year mathematics ..., emphasizing advanced algebra, trigonometry, and certain of the newer mathematics concepts."

Before the actual results are reported, a summary of the methods of scoring the high-school battery of the Stanford will be given. Each Booklet can be scored in several ways. The raw score reported is simply the number of correct responses for a given pupil. No correction for guessing is employed.

Since these raw scores have little meaning in and of themselves, a series of derived scores are provided. The percentile rank of each raw score is reported as well as stanine and corresponding standard score. The stanine is a normally distributed score with a mean of 5 and a standard deviation of 2. They range from 1 to 9 with 5 "always representing the average performance for students in the specific norm group, e.g. college preparatory-ninth grade." The standard score on the Stanford is also based upon the normal distribution with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. Therefore for the total high-school standardization group, a standard score of 50 has a percentile rank of 50% and corresponds to a stanine of 5. A standard score of 60 has a percentile rank of 84% and a stanine of 8, and so on. Full conversion tables, for each grade, are available in the Stanford manual.

Reading

Table 1 shows the number of pupils tested at each grade level as well as the mean and standard deviation of the resulting raw scores.

Table 1

Summary Data for Reading--Alternative Schools

Grade	N	Mean Raw Score	Standard Deviation
10	89	38.3	12.0
11	100	43.6	12.7
12	47	48.1	11.6

The percentile ranks of these three means, based upon total group norms are 56%, 62%, and 64% respectively. (The reader should be aware that these percentile ranks are based upon individual score norms. If the Stanford had provided norms for school averages, the percentile ranks of these averages would be higher.)

Table 2 shows the average standard score (SS), with percentile ranks (PR) and stanines (S) for all pupils tested.

Table 2

Standard Scores, Percentile Ranks, and Stanines for East and West Units

	West				East			
Grade	N	SS	PR	S	N	SS	PR	S
10	36	50	50	5	53	55	74	6
11	42	58	74	6	58	57	70	6
12	25	62	72	6	22	60	66	6

As can be seen from Table 2, there was some between-units variability. For grade 10 the difference in standard scores would indicate an average raw score difference of approximately 7 points. That is, the average student at East obtained correct answers to approximately 7 more items than the average West student. In grades 11 and 12, the average scores were slightly higher in the West unit. While tests of hypotheses employing either errors of estimate or errors of measurement could be calculated, any overall difference between the units would have little practical significance.

Mathematics

Table 3 shows those mathematics data comparable to those in Table 1.

Table 3

Summary Data for Mathematics, Part A,--Alternative Schools

Grade	N	Mean Raw Score	Standard Deviation
10	87	24.7	8.1
11	99	29.1	7.8
12	49	30.4	7.8

Table 4

Total Math Scores--Alternative Schools

Grade	N	Mean Raw Score	Standard Deviation
10	87	31.4	11.4
11	99	39.6	13.8
12	49	43.9	14.5

The percentile ranks of these mean scores are across grades in Part A: 66%, 74%, 84%, and for the total mathematics score, 60%, 74%, and 77%. (The comments concerning percentile norms for average scores also apply to the Mathematics data. In addition, the Stanford manual does not provide norms for Mathematics, Part B separately.)

The table below shows the average standard score (SS) on Part A, for each unit, along with the percentile rank (PR) and stanine (S) of each.

Table 5

Mathematics Scores, Part A, East and West Units

	East			West		
Grade	SS	PR	S	SS	PR	S
10	56	74	6	52	58	5
11	59	74	6	61	80	7
12	58	68	6	64	84	7

For the total Mathematics Subtest (Part B is not scored separately), the corresponding table is given below.

Table 6

Total Mathematics Scores for East and West Units

	East			West		
Grade	SS	PR	S	SS	PR	S
10	53	60	6	49	44	5
11	57	68	6	60	77	7
12	57	64	6	65	86	7

For East and West combined, the chart showing average scores, PR, and stanines follows:

	East and West Part A			Total		
Grade	SS	PR	S	SS	PR	S
10	54	66	6	53	60	6
11	59	74	6	59	74	6
12	64	84	7	61	77	7

Since the objective states that "students will do as well as ... a comparable group in the sending schools," the same subtests were administered to a group of students from the sending high schools. The control group was comprised of 30 students from the cooperating high schools who volunteered for the Alternative Schools Project, but were not selected in the lottery. The control group did not include students from Philadelphia. Therefore, in comparing the scores of students in the control group with those of students from the Alternative Schools, all Philadelphia students were deleted and the mean adjusted.

The tables which follow present a comparison, by grades, of scores from the Alternative School students and scores from students in the control group. For all tables, the following abbreviations are used: Mean RS (mean raw score); Mean SS (mean standard score); PR (percentile rank); S (stanine score).

Table 7

Comparison of Alternative School and Control Group Students in Grade Ten for Part A of the Stanford Mathematics Subtest

	Control N = 10	Alternative Schools N = 75
Mean RS	31.3	25.7
Mean SS	61.0	55.7
PR	88	72
S	7	6

Table 8

Comparison of Alternative School and Control Group Students in Grade Ten for the Combined Subtests in Mathematics

	Control N = 10	Alternative Schools N = 75
Mean RS	41.8	32.8
Mean SS	63.0	52.7
PR	92.0	59
S	8	6

Table 9

Comparison of Alternative School and Control Group Students in Grade Eleven for Part A of the Stanford Mathematics Subtest

	Control N = 19	Alternative Schools N = 88
Mean RS	32.2	29.6
Mean SS	62.0	60.3
PR	84	78
S	7	7

Table 10

Comparison of Alternative School and Control Group Students in Grade Eleven for the Combined Subtests in Mathematics

	N = 19	N = 88
Mean RS	49.2	40.5
Mean SS	64.0	58.9
PR	88	74
S	7	6

Since only one student from the twelfth grade volunteered to act as part of the control group, any comparison between the Alternative Schools and the sending high schools at the twelfth grade level would be meaningless.

Discussion: The above tables indicate that in the area of mathematics, the students from the Alternative Schools did not perform as well, on the average, as did students in the control group on either the first subtest or on the combined scores for the two subtests. The differences are most pronounced in the tenth grade, with a mean raw score discrepancy of 5.6 points. In eleventh grade the discrepancy is much less pronounced, with a difference of 2.6 points between the raw score means on Part A. For the Total Mathematics Scores, the corresponding differences are 14.0 points and 8.7 points respectively.

A t-test using standard error of measurement of the difference in means in standard score units was made to determine whether or not the differences between the Control and Alternative School students were significant at the .05 level.

For Grade 10, Part A, mathematics, the t value of 8.1 was significant and favored the Control group. The difference in Grade 11 Part A was also significant and favored the Control group ($t = 3.4$).

For Grades 10 and 11 the differences on the total mathematics scores favored the Control group with t values of 10.2 and 6.7 respectively.

Any attempt on the part of the evaluators to present a reason for the obvious differences in mean scores is largely speculative. However, the data suggest two plausible hypotheses. It may be that the quality of the students in the Alternative School as measured by traditional "objective" and standardized criteria, is not the same as that of students in the sending schools. In light of the fact that the control group was comprised of similar students; that is, students who volunteered but were not selected, this hypothesis seems largely untenable.

Another hypothesis relates to discrepancies between teachers at the Alternative School and those at the sending schools. It is entirely feasible that the mathematics teachers at the Alternative School "teach toward" or strive for different ends in their teaching than do the mathematics teachers at the traditional high schools. If these standardized tests embody certain precepts commonly reflected in traditional high schools, and if the mathematics classes at the Alternative Schools adhere to a different set of precepts, a set not necessarily reflected in the standardized tests, then the differences between groups may be largely attributable to such value differences.

The data comparing the two groups in terms of reading scores are presented on the following tables.

Table 11

Comparison of Control Group and Alternative School Students for Stanford Reading Subtest--Grade Ten

	Control N = 9	Alternative Schools N = 76
Mean RS	40.8	39.3
Mean SS	57.4	53.8
PR	80	67
S	7	6

Table 12

Comparison of Control Group and Alternative School Students for Stanford Reading Subtest--Grade Eleven

	Control N = 18	Alternative Schools N = 90
Mean RS	47.1	44.4
Mean SS	59.7	57.8
PR	77	73
S	7	6

As was the case for the twelfth grade in the mathematics subtests, no meaningful comparisons are possible between the control group and the Alternative School due to the fact that only one twelfth grade student volunteered to act as a member of the control group.

The t-values in reading favored the control group in both Grades 10 and 11 at the .05 level (Grade 10--t = 3.4, Grade 11--t = 2.4).

Conclusion: The objective was not met for mathematics or reading.

All data for Objectives 2-7 were collected by the resident evaluators using parallel interview questions. The data were then analyzed by the EDC staff. The sample sizes for the January interviews were 31 in East, 23 in West; the sample sizes for the May-June interviews were 31 in East, 22 in West.

OBJECTIVE 2. "STUDENTS WILL EXERCISE INITIATIVE IN DETERMINING THEIR OWN LEARNING ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE BROAD CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK OF THE SCHOOL, TO THE EXTENT THAT AT LEAST 50 PERCENT OF THE STUDENTS WILL HAVE SATISFACTORILY COMPLETED AT LEAST ONE OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES BY JUNE OF 1972: PERFORMED A FIELD STUDY; DEFINED A SIGNIFICANT SCHOOL OR COMMUNITY PROBLEM AND DEVELOPED A STRATEGY FOR ITS SOLUTION; INITIATED OR PARTICIPATED IN MEETINGS, THE PURPOSE OF WHICH BEING TO SEEK A SOLUTION TO A PROBLEM ARISING FROM THE LEARNING PHILOSOPHY OF THE SCHOOL; OR COMPLETED AN INDEPENDENT PROJECT IN THE ARTS OR AN ACADEMIC FIELD. AN INDEPENDENT PROJECT WILL BE ONE IN WHICH THE STUDENT HAS IDENTIFIED THE TOPIC TO BE STUDIED OR THE PROBLEM TO BE SOLVED AND HAS IDENTIFIED THE PROCEDURES TO BE UNDERTAKEN."

Table 13

Number of Students Reporting
Self-Initiated Learning
January 1972

Response	East	West
No	18	5
Yes--class req.[a]	3	15
Yes--self choice[a]	11	9

a. More than one response permitted

Table 14

Number of Students Reporting
Self-Initiated Learning
May 1972

Response	East	West
No	15	3
Yes	17	19

Discussion: Talbes 13 and 14 indicate that between January and May more students participated in self-initiated learning activities. At East, 53% of the students were involved in such activities in May compared to 42% in January; at West, 86% were so involved in May compared with 66% in January.

An examination of end-of-the-year student records at East indicated that 85% had compiled some type of independent study project. Also observations of staff at East and West indicate that several students at both schools had undertaken a high level of responsibility in managing on their own such important school functions as running the town meeting, operating the heating system, decorating the building, publishing student newspapers, organizing travel experiences, and orienting new students.

Conclusions and Recommendations: Although this objective was met and although there is clear evidence that many of the students functioned very independently, some teachers expressed dissatisfaction that many students still seemed too dependent on the teacher for learning. This is in accord with the observation that much of the independent learning cited by students in the survey at East had no direct connection with the classroom experience. It is therefore recommended that the staffs at both schools continue to explore ways of helping the students assume even more responsibility for the learning that in the past has been seen as the teacher's responsibility.

OBJECTIVE 3. "STUDENTS WILL DEMONSTRATE A SIGNIFICANT POSITIVE CHANGE IN ATTITUDE TOWARD:

A. THEIR EXPERIENCES OVER TIME IN THE ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL AND,

B. THEIR EXPERIENCES IN THE ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL AS COMPARED WITH THEIR PREVIOUS SCHOOL EXPERIENCE TO THE EXTENT THAT 75 PERCENT OF THE STUDENTS WILL PREFER THE ENVIRONMENT OF THE ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL AS THE MORE DESIRABLE PLACE FOR THEM TO LEARN."

Table 15

Attitude Toward School
September 1971--January 1972

Response	East	West
Positive	40%	47%
Mixed	50%	51%
Negative	9%	0%
Baseline--October 1971--Positive	97%	75%

The Chi Square value was not significant in any of the East-West comparisons.

Table 16

Attitude Toward School
May--June 1972

Response	East	West
Positive	48%	66%
Mixed	45%	28%
Negative	6%	4%

The Chi Square value was not significant at the .05 level between East and West.

Discussion: The very high positive attitudes in October could have been expected given the voluntary nature of student selection and the fact that 74%

of East students and 54% of West students entered the school to escape from their previous school.[1] Given this initial "halo effect" it is not reasonable to expect the high positive level to be sustained. The rather sharp decline in January in positive attitude was predictable and does not necessarily indicate that students felt negative about the school, but rather that the initial euphoria of the Fall was being replaced by more realistic attitudes. Between January and May, positive attitude increased.

In the May-June interviews, the students were asked if they ever considered returning to their sending schools. Eighty-five percent said they had never considered leaving the Alternative School. Ninety percent of the student body indicated an intent to return in the Fall.

Part IV of this report presents comparative data on the attitudes toward school of the Alternative School students and a Control group. Although a strict reading of Objective 3 would preclude their inclusion, these data will be summarized here because they are judged to be of interest.

Attitude towards teachers: Alternative schools students were more positive.

Student decision making: Alternative students indicated a much higher involvement.

Social concerns: Alternative students perceived themselves as more involved than did control students.

Course evaluation: Alternative students were more positive about their courses.

Affective concerns: Alternative students expressed better feelings about school.

Student relations: Alternative students perceived less friction and more amiability.

Learning: Alternative students were more positive about their learning experiences.

Equality of Opportunity: No difference.

---

[1] See Interim Evaluation Report, p. 12, April 1972.

Evaluative Items: The Alternative students expressed a more positive overall attitude toward school.

These data are so consistent that one has little doubt that the Alternative School elicits strong positive responses from this group of students with respect to 8 of 9 salient dimensions of school climate.

Tables 15 and 16, in addition to indicating an increase in positive attitude, also show that "mixed" attitudes declined at both schools.

Although the direction of attitude change toward the Alternative School is positive and increasing over time in magnitude, there are many students with "mixed" attitudes and a small number with negative attitudes. One possible source of these "mixed" attitudes may be found in the students' responses during the May-June interviews when asked to cite aspects of the home school they felt were superior to the Alternative School (see also the comments quoted later in this section relating to students' perceived strengths and weaknesses of the schools).

Other than the "no response" category, 11 students at East and 9 at West, the responses most frequently made to this comparison were rigor of the course (8 at East, 5 West); school organization (7 East, 1 West); and clear expectations about rules (11 East, 3 West). None of these differences between East and West was statistically significant at the .05 level. Other than rigor of the courses, the number of student responses from West are lower than those from East which may reflect a more satisfactory organizational climate there as perceived by the students interviewed.

Conclusion: Based on the increase in positive attitude toward school between January and June (although no test of significance was made) and the fact that 85% of the students interviewed at the end of the year stated that they had never considered returning to their sending schools, we conclude that Objective 3 has been met although deficiencies in the evaluation design make

this judgment less clear than we would like.

Recommendations: It is evident that many students generally feel positive about their Alternative School experience. It would be important, however, for the evaluators with the Project Director and the staff to develop instruments and processes which would enable them to gather periodically reliable data from students and parents about areas of dissatisfaction so that such data could be used to focus staff energies on priority problems.

OBJECTIVE 4. "AT LEAST 50% OF THE STUDENTS WILL PARTICIPATE IN THE FORMULATION AND EXECUTION OF MECHANISMS SUCH AS COMMITTEES AND TOWN MEETINGS DESIGNED TO MAKE DECISIONS IN THE AREAS OF SCHOOL GOVERNANCE, ALLOCATION OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES, AND GENERAL SCHOOL POLICY. BECAUSE IT SEEMS CLEAR THAT THE FORM OF GOVERNMENT ESTABLISHED AT BOTH SCHOOLS NOMINALLY INCLUDES LITERALLY ALL STUDENTS, IT IS AGREED THAT THIS OBJECTIVE SHOULD BE INTERPRETED TO MEAN 'ACTIVE PARTICIPATION.' THEREFORE THE OBJECTIVE IS TO HAVE AT LEAST 50% OF THE STUDENTS IDENTIFIED AS FUNCTIONING IN ONE OF TWO ROLES: LEADERSHIP ROLE (INITIATES PROPOSALS FOR TOWN MEETINGS OR TASK FORCE MEETING, PLAYS A MAJOR PART IN IMPLEMENTING DECISIONS, MODERATES OR ORGANIZES TASK FORCES OR TOWN MEETINGS); THE GOOD TROOPER ROLE (SHOWS CONTINUOUS PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNMENTAL OR DECISION-MAKING BODIES, ASSISTS IN MAKING AND IMPLEMENTING TASK FORCE PROPOSALS AND TOWN MEETING DECISIONS--BUT DOES NOT USUALLY ASSUME A LEADERSHIP ROLE).

Table 17

Student Perception of Involvement
in Decision Making
January 1972

Response	East	West
Leadership Role	0%	17%
Good Trooper	22%	30%
Nominal Partic.	54%	43%
Non-Partic.	22%	8%

The Chi Square value between East and West was not significant at the .05 level.

Table 18

Student Perception of Involvement
in Decision Making
May-June 1972

Response	East	West
Leadership Role	6%	4%
Good Trooper	32%	41%
Nominal Partic.	38%	50%
Non-Partic.	43%	13%

None of the comparisons between East and West was significant at the .05 level on the Chi Square test.

Discussion: The increase at East in the leadership and good trooper roles from 0 and 22% to 38% between January and June is an encouraging trend. In November 1971 the percentage of participation was 24% (See Interim Report, p. 19).

Participation at West involved more students and held relatively constant from November 1971 to June 1972 in the 43% to 45% range.

Non-participation, on the other hand, almost doubled at East and increased slightly at West. Without more in-depth data little can be said about the significance of the simultaneous increase in both participation and non-participation between January and June at East. It would be helpful in future planning to know, for example, if these two sub-groups are similar with respect to such variables as academic achievement or personal-social values, or if they are different with respect to these or other variables. They are responding to "something"--what is it?

It would be helpful if some of the attitudes toward governance discussed in the Interim Report; e.g., students perceived town meetings as being ineffective, felt that they had great potential influence at the schools, could be compared with attitudes existing in May-June, but no data were collected relative to these dimensions.

The tendency noted in the Interim Report of many students to "delegate" to faculty decision-making power, or to respond to governance processes only when a crisis arose, we find disturbing for two reasons. First, the democratic governance process envisioned for both schools is in itself intrinsically educative; second, the parallels in "real life" between adult apathy and excessive delegation of power in local, state, and Federal government affairs, or responding to social issues only when one is politically threatened, and those reported for many of the students, are painfully obvious. One place to begin to break out of the circle of apathy is in school.

Conclusion: Objective 4 was not met.

Recommendations: The schools should continue to work toward the goal of increasing the level of student involvement in decision-making and governance, since active participation is not only educative but should be one of the central goals of schools in a democracy. It is recommended that the staff, along with students and parents, continue to examine the extent to which the present structures for governance do in fact facilitate such active participation.

OBJECTIVE 5. "AT LEAST 50% OF THE STUDENTS WILL DEMONSTRATE A HIGHER RATE OF INVOLVEMENT WITH SOCIAL PROBLEMS AS DEFINED BY THE STUDENTS, THROUGH EITHER ACADEMIC OR FIELDWORK ACTIVITIES, THAN THEY DID DURING THE PREVIOUS YEAR."

Table 19

Percentage of Students Reporting Community Involvement

	January		May-June	
Response	East	West	East	West
Yes	67%	56%	58%	50%
No	32%	43%	42%	50%

The Chi Square value was not significant at the .05 level.

Discussion: The percentage of students involved in social problems is given in Table 19. These percentages reflect the school's effort, through scheduling of courses such as pollution, poverty, and women's rights, and by making time available during Intensive Learning Weeks, to encourage social involvement. There can be no doubt of the school's effort to meet this objective.

To evaluate the objective it is necessary to know the rate of involvement during the 1970-71 school year and the data available at this writing are ambiguous--an oversight of the evaluators and not of the school. An October student interview summary indicates that two-thirds of the students were involved in social problems and that approximately one-third of this group was continuing work begun the previous year. Without knowing the percentage of previous involvement in each unit to subtract from the percentages given in Table 19, it is impossible accurately to assess the objective.

A survey of 64 students at West by the program auditor reported 81% involvement which was substantiated by specific dates, places, and duties.

Conclusion: Because of deficiencies in the evaluation procedures, this objective cannot be assessed.

OBJECTIVE 6. "AT LEAST 50% OF THE STUDENTS WILL DEMONSTRATE, FROM SEPTEMBER TO JUNE, A MORE POSITIVE SELF-IMAGE, AS DETERMINED BY THE INSTRUMENTS USED TO ASSESS THIS DIMENSION."

Table 20

Self-Image as Assessed on Four Dimensions
January 1972

Dimension	East	West	X^2
Learning			15.56 < .05 favoring East
Positive	90%	47%	
Neg.	9%	13%	
No Res.	0%	39%	
Self-Discip. & Motivation			18.02 < .05 favoring East
Positive	77%	21%	
Neg.	12%	21%	
No Res.	9%	56%	
Interpersonal Rel.			Not Significant
Positive	43%	21%	
Negative	32%	13%	
No Res.	25%	66%	
Other			Not Significant
Positive	0%	21%	
Neg.	0%	8%	
No Res.	100%	69%	

Table 21

Self-Image as Assessed on Eight Dimensions
May-June 1972

Dimensions	East		West	
	% Oct.[a]	June	% Oct.[a]	June
Learner	(27)	29%	(42)	45%
Racial		0		0
Interpersonal	(39)	19%	(42)	31%
Individuality	(67)	64%	(33)	27%
Self-discipline	(26)	29%	(25)	0
Contentment	(42)	58%	(50)	31%
Independence		48%		13%
Other		0		13%
No Response		9%		0

[a]From p. 24 Interim Report

None of the Chi Square comparisons were significant at the .05 level.

Discussion: All of the responses above reflect a positive self image on the dimensions assessed. A few negative responses were reported: East, 1 on image of the self as a learner; West, 3 on self as a learner, 1 racial, and 1 on self-discipline.

The four dimensions of self-image in Table 20 were derived by content analysis in response to three questions asked by the interviewers which asked the student to state how he felt school had been going in the last month, how he felt about what he had been doing in school lately, and if the student's attitude about school had changed since the beginning of the year.

The May-June question was more open-ended which asked the student to state how he felt about himself as a person this year in comparison with last year.

Because the January questions were more restrictive in that they focussed on school and two of the three questions limited reactions to the past month, little emphasis will be given to these data. The May-June data are more

appropriate to consider because they represent feelings at the end of the year and because the wording of the question focusses more on the self and invites the inclusion of both the Alternative school experience and experience in schools previously attended. The fact also that the content analysis of the May-June data resulted in five dimensions which are similar to those derived in October 1971 makes possible beginning- and end-of-the-year comparisons on self-image which is called for by the wording of the objective.

1. Since self-concept is a composite of beliefs, attitudes, and values toward one's self in relation to the environment, it should not be forgotten that the environment of the home and community is also exercising an influence here. One can expect a great deal from the school in this area being aware, at the same time, that the school is not the total environment of the student.

It would be interesting in this respect to collect self-image data relative to the community and family environments to determine possible relationships or influences on the school self-image dimension.

2. Motivation is an important aspect of self-image and one notes its absence from the dimensions assessed. Direct questions or observational data might be used to assess this dimension.

3. Since there is some evidence that inner-city students placed in integrated schools develop a lower self-image, the possible influence of this phenomenon in the data reported here should be noted. Evidence also suggests "mixing" students across social class lines may adversely influence the self-concept of the student from the lower social class.

Self-image data for the black students might well be studied

separately and, given certain conditions, compared with self-image data collected this year at the West Philadelphia Community Free School.

Sample Student Comments at West and East
Quoted from Every Third Student in the Sample (West)

West

1. I feel I get along better with everyone and everything. Never liked school--loved vacations, but this year I don't care.

2. I'm the only Black student in my classes. I feel out of it. Sometimes they cut down Blacks in classes. Racial slurs from kids on Spain trip.

I'm more open this year. I rarely talked last year in school, but here I do all the time--outside classes.

3. If I had something to say there (old school) I wouldn't be listened to--here I would. I had a feeling of smallness there. Here I feel more an individual. I am a loner, though. I've always only had a few friends.

4. I've learned more this year--people-wise, besides English and social studies. Have more friends here, too. I think I've opened up a lot to people. Kids pull you in here.

5. I feel more involved--more important in decision-making--Fred's proposal, etc.

I'm more self-motivated. Last year I was lazy; got all C's. This school forced me to do independent work--molded me into a student. Here I get what I like.

6. Last year I wasn't sure of myself. But now I really feel secure, make decisions. I know if I don't do something I'm cutting my own throat.

7. Work I turn over isn't as much as at ____. I don't know what the reasons are--whether it's me or the teachers aren't expecting as much. But I do

feel I've accepted a challenge. It's my responsibility to do the work and I'm fairly satisfied the way I've met it.

I feel more like I count ... It's ego building to succeed! And they let you succeed here.

East

1. I am now more aware of my weaknesses; teachers here made you face yourself.

2. It (the school) has given me a chance to grow up, to learn what I want, to find out who I am.

3. I feel more free, more independent, able to choose for myself.

4. People treat me like a person, not a number.

5. School makes me more aware of others; I no longer think just of myself.

6. I am not the same person: (I am) more open and independent, but I am not sure if the school caused the changes or just permitted them to happen.

7. I might have learned more at -------, but it wouldn't have been worth it. Here I have become a person.

Conclusion: In quantitative terms, the objective was achieved at East for two dimensions: individuality and contentment; it was not met at West.

In qualitative terms, one cannot read the typical student comments and not sense the very positive impact of the school on the student's sense of self. That elusive but very real force, school climate, is doing its work.

Recommendations: The goal of enhanced self-image is a critical goal, since there is much evidence linking self-esteem to achievement. And while there is

some evidence that the Alternative Schools did enhance the self-esteem of most of its students, the question is so complex that the following studies should be instituted:

1. More precise base-line data should be secured in September so as to make comparisons in June more meaningful, and an attempt should be made to achieve greater consistency in collecting and analyzing data.

2. There should be some attempt made to study the differential impact of the school on self-image. There is some evidence in other studies and in this evaluation, for example, that inner-city disadvantaged students placed in an essentially suburban milieu show a decline in self-image. And one would suspect that the self-image of a high achieving student would be diminished in a school environment which de-emphasizes competition and minimizes such extrinsic rewards as class rank and honor societies.

OBJECTIVE 7. "BY THE END OF THE SCHOOL YEAR, 50% OF THE STUDENTS WILL HAVE SPENT AT LEAST 10 HOURS OF CLASSROOM TIME FUNCTIONING IN THE ROLE OF TEACHER."

Seventy percent of East's students spent 0 to 5 hours in the teacher's role; at West, 52% spent this amount of time. Nine students spent 10 hours or more in a teaching role at East compared with 5 students at West.

Conclusion: This objective was not met.

Recommendations: There is much evidence from other studies that when students teach students, both gain from the experience. This suggests that the staffs at both schools should try to improve the amount of such teaching next year by exploring such approaches as these:

1. Each teacher should identify for each of his sections one or more students who are interested in tutoring.

2. The teaching staff should organize a student tutoring program in the basic skills areas.

3. Students should be able to earn academic credit, if they desire it, for completing a given number of hours of instructional service.

4. A concerted effort should be made to increase the number of student-taught courses. Staff members should make themselves available to students who wish to teach courses but feel the need for some adult support and direction.

5. The staff should explore the use of student-teacher teams, a practice which might give more explicit sanction to the student as teacher.

OBJECTIVE 8. ALL STUDENTS WILL, AT LEAST ONCE EVERY EIGHT WEEKS, PARTICIPATE IN VERBAL AND WRITTEN EVALUATION OF THE SCHOOL'S PROGRAM, TEACHERS AND ADMINISTRATORS.

This objective was assessed as it was for the Interim Evaluation Report, through the perceptions of the two resident evaluators. The close involvement of these two evaluators with the daily, ongoing process of the two schools obviates the need for more complex data-gathering procedures to assess this objective.

The Interim Evaluation Report concluded that "though frequent evaluation of the program, teachers and administrators takes place, the evaluation is of a verbal, face-to-face nature and rarely, if ever, written. The evaluators feel that the problems of collecting written data are so great that it is unrealistic to attempt a written evaluation of all students once every eight weeks."

The evaluators believe that the situation regarding this objective has not changed since the writing of the Interim Evaluation Report. Students still engage in almost daily evaluation of teachers, administrators and the general school program. They do so in Town Meetings, in classes and in frequent informal dialogues with the faculty and Project Director both at faculty meetings and entirely spontaneously.

Written evaluations, however, have occurred only twice during the year; once in the Fall and once in the Spring. The evaluators still maintain that to increase the incidence of formal, written evaluations by the students would be unproductive.

Conclusion: The objective calls for "verbal and written evaluation." Therefore, the objective is not being met at either school. The evaluators feel that the objective as currently stated is an unrealistic one, and suggest that it be rewritten for the coming year to stipulate either verbal or written evaluations.

Recommendations: It was evident at both schools that there was some misunderstanding concerning the extent to which negative student evaluations could be used to effect a teacher's dismissal. It is therefore recommended that a task force of students, staff, and parents develop explicit guidelines concerning this question.

Additional Interview Data

Because space and time limitations make it impossible to present all of the data analyzed, data from the May-June 1972 interviews will be briefly summarized to alert the reader that data not reported earlier in this section exists.

1. Students at East reported higher involvement in decision making in the Fall; at West, the involvement held relatively constant throughout the year.

2. The large majority of students at both schools reported academic counselling to be satisfactory or excellent (6 at West); college counselling had most of the responses in the "no response" category presumably because most of the students were not at the stage where they were actively seeking placement; most of the students reported personal counselling to be either satisfactory or excellent (14 at West).

3. There were a number of criticisms of the counselling groups at both units most of which revolved around organizational problems--no goals, too much talking, no attempt at group work, not relevant, etc. At West, the 12 student comments reveal a unique personal response with very little overlap among them. Fourteen students at East made no response, the largest single response category.

4. Students at West were asked to cite three major problem areas of the school. The responses are not easily patterned and have been grouped under seven headings for ease in reading. Enough responses will be presented to reveal the texture of all responses under each heading.

West

Curriculum

More individualized programs

Rigor of courses (more)

Need a physical education program

West--Curriculum continued

More and different English courses

More commercial courses

Better curriculum development within each department

No music

Communication

Communication poor; no way to check rumors

More school-community interaction

Suburban-Philadelphia kids should get to know each other more

Better communication with part-time teachers and parents

Goals

Need to define school's purpose relative to varying student needs

Clearer guidelines for kids and school without limiting potential of the school (about 5 comments expressing this general idea)

Administration--Process

Make course requirements known earlier

Something wrong with schedule--prevents too many kids from getting deeply involved (2 comments)

Next year we need a hell of a lot more organization and discipline

New kids--some are coming just to "party"

Relate counselling groups to the school's objectives--when they have been decided

New director should be closer to the students

Teaching

More evaluation of teachers (2 comments)

Some poor classes

Part-time staff a mess--needs improving

Discipline

Kids don't feel responsible for one another (2 comments)

Lots of stealing--people coming into school

Students cut classes at will

Some kids need more teacher control

Philadelphia kids messing school up

Too many disputes in decision-making

Building

Getting a building for next year

More concern for care of the building

Don't like the building

Need a "quiet room" to meet in

East

Student evaluation of positive and negative aspects of Alternative East. Questionnaire administered on May 24, 1972. N equals 120.

Positive Aspects

1. Atmosphere--95 responses--the adjectives most frequently used by the students to describe the atmosphere of the school were "free," "relaxed," "experimental," and "friendly."

2. Freedom to choose types of learning experiences and type of evaluation desired--46 responses--students felt that this freedom extended to the total school community, including the teachers.

3. Student-teacher relationships--47 responses--the students felt that the school had facilitated the creation of a new type of student-teacher relationship, such that the two groups really expressed care for each other as human beings.

4. School has expanded learning opportunities to include more than traditional classroom activities--26 responses--students felt that the classroom was no longer posited as the sole legitimate location in which learning could go on. Among the most frequent examples of non-classroom learning were the trips to Spain and Canada and various field trips connected with certain classes.

5. Lack of pressure--18 responses--the students responding to this dimension indicated that the relative absence of academic pressure was a positive aspect.

6. Large variety and diversity of course offerings--16 responses--students appreciated the opportunity to select from a wide variety of courses and further liked being able to satisfy such things as English and History requirements in a number of different ways.

7. Increased communication between people--16 responses--primarily, the students cited a deeper and more meaningful relationship with their peers which they believe was facilitated by the school.

8. Opportunity provided to get individual attention when needed--12 responses--students felt that the general atmosphere and small size, plus the dimension of faculty-student trust made it easy to get individualized attention.

9. Opportunity for independent study--23 responses--students cited the opportunity to structure their own learning when desired.

10. Small size of school and small number of people per class--15 responses--students felt that the small size made learning easier.

11. School teaches a greater sense of responsibility--10 responses--students felt that they had become more responsible for their own learning.

12. School has increased students' motivation--10 responses.

13. School has provided a better learning environment--10 responses.

14. School has enabled students to function in the role of decision makers--18 responses--students cited their total involvement in the daily operations of the school.

15. The methods teachers use in the classrooms are better than in schools previously attended--7 responses--students cited the teachers' use of discussion techniques and non-structured classes.

16. School is a good preparation for college--3 responses--students thought that the freedom which they were given would stand them in good stead during college.

17. The school provides excellent exposure to political problems--3 responses.

18. The classrooms are good--2 responses

Negative Aspects

1. Lack of stress in academic areas--20 responses--students criticized the school for its failure to stress "academic" learning, citing the absence of required written work and difficult intellectual exercise.

2. Math program is generally weak--19 responses--criticisms of the math program varied; some students openly criticized the teaching, others felt that a more traditional math class should be offered for students wishing to avail themselves of it and still others felt that the teachers in this area had not been responsive to their needs.

3. Lack of general organization--19 responses--students were very general in their criticism here, some cited poor record keeping, and others a lack of explicit administrative structure.

4. No definition of decision-making structure--16 responses--students were unclear on how decisions are made and who makes them.

5. School is much too dirty--16 responses--some students felt that a crew of professional maintenance men should be hired.

6. Poor communications within school--13 responses--students felt that meetings, especially, were not sufficiently publicized.

7. Need for more structure in classes--11 responses.

8. Need more discipline--9 responses--students felt that teachers should demand more of the students, to the point of imposing disciplinary sanctions.

9. Teachers should put more pressure on students to work--12 responses.

10. Need for better counselling--8 responses--students cited the need for better counselling in the areas of vocational guidance and college selection.

11. Insufficient teaching-learning materials--9 responses--student complaints in this area included the need for more textbooks and extended to needed modifications in the physical plant such as bigger classrooms.

12. Need for better relationships with the surrounding community--9 responses--students felt that the rapport engendered this year between the school and the community was inadequate.

13. Insufficient transportation--7 responses.

14. School gives inadequate college preparation--7 responses.

15. Teacher expectancies of students are too low--7 responses--students felt that since the teachers demanded so little of the students that the latter's expectancies were low.

16. Improve basic skill areas, especially science and math--9 responses.

17. Visitors present a problem--6 responses--there are too many visitors wandering around the halls

18. Too much stealing--6 responses.

19. There is not enough cooperation among the total community to achieve common goals--7 responses.

20. No response to the question--5 students.

21. Not enough attention given to those with special educational problems--5 responses.

22. No strong leadership--5 responses.

23. Student apathy--7 responses.

24. Better organization of lunch facilities--4 responses.

25. More things to do during non-classroom time--4 responses. Students were concerned that the school did not provide enough activities for them during the time that they were not in class.

26. Staff apathy--4 responses.

27. Students are sufficiently willing to accept responsibility--5 responses--students felt that the community took undue advantage of the freedoms offered to them.

28. Teachers don't place enough emphasis on teaching--3 responses.

29. Classes are too traditional, teachers haven't developed innovative approaches--3 responses.

PART II

TEACHER OBJECTIVES

Introduction

As the evaluators indicated in the Interim Evaluation Report, the assessment of Teacher Objectives posed a problem at both schools during the past year. This problem pertained to the development and implementation of classroom observation instruments to be employed systematically during the course of the year.

The use of such measurement techniques was not feasible this year because of a reluctance on the part of the staffs at both schools to permit "intrusions" into their classrooms at a time when the school was still in its formative stages.

Because the evaluators were unable to make periodic classroom visits to observe teacher behavior, it is impossible to document this area. The evaluators believe, however, that this problem has been rectified for the coming year.

Most of the data concerning the classroom performance of teachers for the past year stem from the two rounds of staff interviews conducted by the resident evaluators in the Fall and the Spring. In these interviews teachers were asked to assess their own classroom performance in terms stipulated by the objectives. While this was not the most desirable form of information-gathering technique in this area, the evaluators believe that it was entirely suitable for the first year of the schools' operations.

A secondary source of data pertaining to teacher performance is the evaluation performed by the students at each school during the Spring. Although the form of this evaluation differed at each of the two schools, making comparability of results very difficult, it is obvious that the students have acute perceptions of their teachers along a number of dimensions.

The student evaluations of teachers were intended primarily as a method of providing the teachers with uniform feedback on their behavior. For this reason, students responded to dimensions which they, in conjunction with the teachers, considered important. Therefore, the results of these evaluations do not bear directly upon the objectives as stated in the Formal Proposal. A summary of the student evaluations will be included in a later section of this report.

ASSESSMENT OF TEACHER OBJECTIVES

OBJECTIVE 1. BY JUNE, 1972, ALL TEACHERS WILL HAVE A MORE POSITIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD TEACHING IN THE ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL THAN IN OTHER SCHOOLS IN WHICH THEY HAVE TAUGHT.

This objective was measured via the use of the two staff interviews which have been previously discussed. All of the full-time faculty members at each school were interviewed twice during the course of the year.

The Interim Evaluation Report included results from the first round of staff interviews. On the basis of those interviews it concluded that, at the time the report was written, the objective was being met at each of the two units.

During the second round of staff interviews the faculty was again queried about their attitudes toward teaching in the Alternative Schools, as compared to teaching in other schools with which they had had experience. At the West Unit, 7 of the 9 full-time staff members had previous teaching experience against which they could compare teaching at the Alternative School; at the East Unit, 10 of the 12 full-time staff members had previous teaching experience.

When asked during an interview situation to state whether they preferred teaching in the Alternative School to other schools in which they had taught, all of the 7 staff members at the West Unit who had had prior teaching experience replied that they decidedly prefer teaching in the Alternative School.

Clearly, this objective is being met at the West Unit. The following statements are a representative sampling of teachers' comments pertaining to the interview question about preferring the Alternative School to other places in which they had taught, and are noteworthy in their uniform affirmation of the West Unit as a superior place in which to teach.

> "I'd be 9½ on a 10 point scale! I stand committed to staying with the project. Compared to former teaching situations, this is heaven on earth. I have autonomy, trust and good relations all around."

> "Incomparable: My concept of science education has always been this and I couldn't do it until now ... I am able to be totally creative. .."

> "I really love it. This is my idea of what teaching is. This is the first time I've been treated like I have dignity."

The feelings of the two first-year teachers are reflected in the statement made by one of them in response to the same interview question.

> "I am very positive and there hasn't really been any change in my attitude during the year. I feel like I have had much more than one year's worth of experience this year--I feel seasoned. This is teaching as I imagined it ought to be."

At the East Unit the pattern of teachers' responses was similar, though not congruent to those at the West Unit. Of the 10 full-time staff members who had previous teaching experience, 9 of the teachers strongly preferred teaching at the Alternative School to others in which they had taught. A single staff member chose to leave the Alternative School, but did not return to his previous school.

The objective stipulates that "all teachers" shall prefer teaching in the Alternative School. Due to the departure of the full-time faculty member

at the East Unit, this objective was not met. The evaluators believe, however, that given the uniformly positive vein of the responses from the other 9 teachers, plus strongly positive responses from the 2 staff members who had no previous teaching experience, the failure of the East Unit to meet this objective rests more on narrow, technical grounds rather than on substantive grounds.

In addition to being asked whether or not they preferred teaching in the Alternative School to others in which they had taught, teachers were also asked to indicate any change in attitude regarding the Alternative Schools which they may have undergone during the course of the year. The following chart summarizes the types of attitude changes which occurred.

Table 1

Changes in Teachers' Attitudes Towards Schools

	East	West
Highly positive attitudes about teaching throughout the year	6	3
Increasingly positive attitudes during the year though mostly positive from the beginning	4	2
Mostly positive attitudes all year with random periods of ups and downs	0	1
Mostly positive attitudes during beginning of year, mixed to negative during middle of year, mixed to positive at end of year	0	1
Mixed-negative at beginning of the year and increased positive attitude by the end of the year, though not highly positive	0	1
Positive in the beginning of the year, mixed-negative at end of the year	2	0

Discussion: The above chart corroborates the data presented previously in relation to the question about preferring teaching in the Alternative School to

other teaching situations. Almost all of the teachers had positive attitudes about teaching in the schools from the beginning of their experience, and maintained these attitudes throughout the year. Even those who were not highly positive in the beginning of the year tended to be more strongly positive about their teaching experience by the end of the year. Of those teachers who indicated a strengthening in positive attitudes about the school the following statements are representative.

> " ... my faith that others are concerned with other options like mutual trust, respect, and a desire to be free of conventional shackles ... has been restored."
>
> "I am seeing teaching more and more in terms of providing resources and experiences ..."
>
> "I have discovered some new ways of motivating students and have been successful with some classroom techniques I had never before used."

Conclusion

The two schools have been very successful in creating and maintaining highly positive teacher attitudes towards their teaching throughout the course of the year. The objective has been met at the West Unit, and while it has not been successfully met at the East Unit, this failure is not significant, stemming, as it does, from the dissatisfaction of only one staff member.

OBJECTIVE 2. ALL TEACHERS WILL USE MORE VARIED MATERIALS AND TEACHING METHODS THAN INTERACTION ANALYSIS STUDIES REPORT IS TRUE OF TEACHERS IN TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS.

Data pertaining to this objective were collected through the staff interviews because, as previously stated, it was not possible to use normative-referenced instruments to assess this objective. Since no objective measures

of classroom performance are available at the present time, no conclusions as to the success or failure of either of the units in meeting this objective will be drawn. The interviews did provide some data describing the teachers' perceptions of their classroom performance in terms of using varied materials and methods. These data are presented in the two tables which follow, and indicate not only the employment of a wide variety of methods and materials but also illustrate discrepancies in the frequency with which they are used. The data are limited by other evidence on research on teaching which indicates that most teachers have to be taught to analyze objectively the teaching act.

Table 2

Frequency of Using Various Teaching Materials

	Never		Rarely (1-10%)		Sometimes (10-25%)		Regularly (25-40%)		Basic Medium	
	E	W	E	W	E	W	E	W	E	W
1. Textbooks	3	3	1	1	2	0	2	2	3	4
2. Paperback books (on special topics)	2	0	0	2	1	4	3	2	1	4
3. Xeroxed material (magazine articles, pages of books, etc.)	2	0	1	0	2	2	5	6	2	1
4. Teacher developed material	0	0	2	0	0	4	7	4	2	1
5. Films	5	1	1	4	1	3	1	1	0	0
6. Records or tape recordings	5	2	2	3	3	0	1	4	1	0
7. Audio-visual aids (overhead projector)	4	3	1	5	4	0	1	1	0	0
8. Laboratory equipment	7	6	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	1
9. Student developed materials	5	1	1	4	4	4	1	0	0	1
10. Other (musical instruments)	10	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0

Discussion

The table illustrates that textbooks and Xeroxed materials seemed to be the most standard materials used in teaching at both schools. At the West Schoop paperback books on special topics are also used with high frequency, while at the East Unit their use, though frequent, is not as prevalent. Both schools also use materials developed by individual teachers on a regular basis, though use of student developed materials is slightly more pronounced at the West Unit than at the East Unit. Neither films nor other audio-visual aids are used regularly at either unit though the former are slightly more prevalent at the West Unit and the latter at the East Unit. The use of records or tape recordings is also about the same between the two units, both of which use them on a basis that varies from "Sometimes" to "Regularly."

Conclusion

Although the Teacher Objective states that "All teachers will use more and varied materials than is true of teachers in traditional schools" no comparison to the variety of materials actually used in a traditional classroom can be made. It is evident, however, that a wide array of materials is being used at each unit with at least one or more teachers using all types of materials either "Regularly" or as a "Basic Medium."

In addition to being asked about their use of various teaching materials, the full-time staff at each school was asked to indicate how often they used a variety of teaching methods in their classes. The following table presents that data.

Table 3

Frequency of Usage of Teaching Methods

	Never		Rarely (1-10%)		Sometimes (10-25%)		Regularly (25-40%)		Basic Technique	
	E	W	E	W	E	W	E	W	E	W
1. Teacher led discussion	1	0	0	0	4	0	4	2	3	7
2. Teacher lecture	3	1	3	6	4	2	2	0	1	0
3. Mini-lecture and discussion	2	1	2	0	4	5	1	2	1	1
4. Small group discussions	0	1	1	2	5	5	2	1	2	0
5. Small group projects	2	2	3	2	3	2	1	3	0	0
6. Reading in class	4	1	1	5	3	1	1	1	2	1
7. Writing in class	4	3	4	3	2	2	0	2	2	0
8. Role playing	3	5	0	5	1	2	2	1	0	2
9. Games	3	6	4	2	0	2	2	1	0	1
10. Debate	7	5	2	3	1	0	1	1	0	0
11. Dramatizations	6	4	2	3	2	1	2	0	0	1
12. Tutoring	0	0	1	0	3	3	5	5	2	1
13. Field experiences	1	1	4	2	3	2	2	2	1	2
14. Student in role of teacher	0	1	2	0	5	5	2	3	2	0
15. Teacher demonstration	3	4	3	2	3	1	0	2	1	0
16. Independent research	2	0	1	2	6	1	1	3	1	3

Discussion

The table reveals that the two techniques most frequently used by the teachers in their classes (those used regularly or as a basic technique) are Teacher Led Discussion and Tutoring. These techniques are used at least Regularly by a majority of both staffs. At the West Unit the staff also makes at least regular use of Independent Research, which is employed with lesser frequency at the East Unit. Techniques used second most often are Mini-lecture and Discussion, Student in the Role of Teacher, and Small Group Discussion. Techniques rarely if ever used by both staffs include Teacher Lecture, though it is used somewhat more at the East Unit than the West Unit; Reading in Class, which is slightly more prominent at the East Unit; Educational Games; Debating; Dramatizations and Teacher Demonstrations. Finally, there appear to be a number of teaching methods which differ markedly in the amount they are used by various members of the full-time staff in their classes. These include: Small Group Projects; Writing in Class, Role Playing, and Field Experiences.

With the exception of Independent Research, which is used more frequently at the West Unit than at the East Unit, the data indicate no glaring differences in frequency of various teaching methods between the two schools.

The chart also reveals that the "affective techniques" such as Role Playing, Games and Dramatizations, are used very infrequently at each school. This may indicate that neither staff feels the need to employ such techniques. Most probably, however, it indicates that these techniques are not a part of the repertoire of teaching behaviors available to the two staffs.

Of the 16 possible teaching methods mentioned, 9 techniques are used as a Basic Technique by one or more teachers at the West Unit and 10 are used as a Basic Technique by at least one teacher at the East Unit. This suggests that a fairly wide variety of teaching methods are used in each school, and

that the usage of different techniques varies widely among the teachers.

Conclusion:

Due to the absence of objective records of teacher behaviors and normative data against which these behaviors could be compared, it is not possible at this time to determine whether the objective is being met at either school. The data do indicate a variety of teaching techniques being utilized as well as differences in frequencies in the use of these techniques by the teachers. The evaluation to be undertaken next year will address itself to the question "What is the quality and appropriateness of these techniques?" For the present, however, the evaluators are satisfied that the teachers are consciously attempting to increase the number of classroom techniques which they employ.

As a final check on the variety of methods and materials used in their classes, teachers were asked to compare the variety of methods and materials which they used during the past year with the variety employed during previous years. The following table presents this data.

Table 4

Method Comparison with Previous Teaching

	Less		Same		More	
	E	W	E	W	E	W
Variety of teaching methods used this year compared to previous years	1	0	3	0	6	7
Variety of teaching materials used this year compared to previous years	1	1	5	1	4	5

Discussion

The table illustrates that all of the experienced teachers at the West

Unit report using a greater variety of methods than they had during the previous year; at the East Unit, two thirds of the teachers report using a greater variety of methods while at the Alternative School. Furthermore, a large majority of the West Unit staff report a concomitant increase in the variety of teaching materials used, while slightly less than half of the experienced teachers at the East Unit report a similar increase.

These data indicate that, in general, more of the staff at the West Unit report increasing the variety of their teaching methods and materials, yet the two tables immediately preceding this one indicated no substantial differences in number of methods and materials used, nor in the frequencies with which they were employed at either of the two schools, though the variance among the individual teachers was great. Given these facts, it is possible that the staff at the East Unit had a greater repertoire of methods and materials prior to this year that they had developed during other teaching experiences. If this be the case, they would not report employing a greater variety of methods and materials in the classroom to the extent that their counterparts at the West Units do.

Conclusion

The data in this table substantiate the fact that teachers at the Alternative School are in general taking advantage of an opportunity to broaden their array of teaching techniques and materials. The quality and effectiveness of both materials and methods will be investigated during the second year evaluation.

OBJECTIVE 3. ALL TEACHERS WILL PARTICIPATE IN THE FORMULATION AND EXECUTION OF MECHANISMS SUCH AS COMMITTEES AND TOWN MEETINGS DESIGNED TO MAKE DECISIONS IN THE AREAS OF SCHOOL GOVERNANCE, CURRICULUM, ALLOCATIONS OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND GENERAL SCHOOL POLICY.

This objective was assessed by using the observations of the resident evaluator in each unit. Since each of these evaluators is so thoroughly

involved in all of the daily operations of the school, each has had ample opportunity to observe both the incidence and quality of the involvement of the staff in decision making.

Discussion

The Interim Evaluation Report stated that "the evidence of staff participation at all levels of the operations of the two schools is ... obvious ... (and) ... is visible to the most casual observer. Staff members meet at least once a week to make decisions on all facets of the schools' operations."

Though certain members of the staff can, and in fact do, wield more influence than other staff members, the basic fact of total faculty involvement in the decision-making process remains unchanged at each school, with virtually all staff members at both schools deeply enmeshed with the process so that, in the words of the resident evaluator at the West Unit, " ... by the end of the year staff meetings have emerged as the single most important locus of decision making."

Since the first round of staff interviews, it has become evident to the two resident evaluators that, despite participation in decision making by all staff members, in practice, about half the staff is more informed about and involved in general decision making and the administration of the schools. Therefore, while there is no formal, rigid hierarchical structure at either school among the staff members, it has become evident that certain teachers both formulate and impiement most of the decisions, although it is equally true that all of the staff members generally discuss and come to consensus about a decision before it is implemented.

At the West Unit, this pattern of differential involvement and influence has created some resentment on the part of a few faculty members who do not wish to devote much time to administration, feeling that their major responsitility is to teach. While they wish to be informed of decisions and to have minimal involvement in the decision-making process, they feel that it

is unreasonable to have to do as much administration as was necessary during the past year.

Apparently, both staffs felt the process of involving every staff member in every decision to be somewhat unwieldy. In an effort to streamline the daily decision-making procedures for the next year, each staff has selected a coordinating teacher who will serve as head of each unit. This teacher will coordinate the various decision-making processes occurring within each school, and will be given the authority to make certain day-to-day decisions.

The evaluators believe that the presence of differential decision-making influence was inevitable; especially in schools which encouraged their students and teachers to "do your own thing." Clearly, protracted involvement in the lengthy and often difficult procedure undergirding the decision-making process is not appealing to all teachers. It has become evident during the past year that, for the most part, the teachers who are less involved with the decision-making process are willing to trust their more involved colleagues to make responsible decisions.

Conclusion: The evidence of all staff being at least somewhat involved in the decision-making process at both schools is very strong. It is obvious that the objective is being met at each school. It is equally obvious that differential states of involvement with decision making do exist which culminate in certain staff members having more influence than others. This tendency seems to be inevitable, and does not seem dysfunctional to either the quality of decision making, nor has it adversely affected inter-staff relationships.

OBJECTIVE 4. AT LEAST ONCE EVERY EIGHT WEEKS ALL TEACHERS WILL PARTICIPATE IN VERBAL AND WRITTEN EVALUATION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP OF THE SCHOOL.

As was the case with the objective discussed above, this objective was assessed through the observations of the two resident evaluators. Because both resident evaluators strongly believed that nothing had altered significantly since the time the Interim Evaluation Report was written, neither felt it necessary to include a question pertaining to the objective in the second round of staff interviews.

Discussion

The Interim Evaluation Report states that the staff in each school had such easy accessibility to the Project Director that verbal feedback between the staff and the Director was a recurring phenomenon occurring with almost daily frequency. Such an atmosphere, the evaluators believed, precluded the necessity for any formal written evaluation by the staff of the administrative leadership of the school.

Nothing has occurred, since April, to alter the evaluators' perceptions in regard to this objective. The staff at each of the two units has frequent and prolonged contact with the Project leadership, both on an individual basis and as a group, and neither staff is at all reticent in terms of informing the Director of their feelings pertaining to his performance. In fact, during the course of the year, the evaluation team has noted an innumerable number of occasions on which the Project Director has actively encouraged such feedback.

The decision-making process at both schools is such that each staff has had the opportunity to participate in the formulation of virtually every major decision affecting its particular unit. Consequently, the Project Director, while he may argue cogently for the acceptance of his own point of view, makes remarkably few unilateral decisions. Thus, the bilateral nautre

of the decision-making process of the Alternative Schools Project greatly facilitates frequent staff-Director feedback.

Conclusion

The objective is explicit in calling for "verbal and written evaluation of the administrative leadership." While the staff at each unit engages in almost daily oral evaluation, the very frequency of the latter obviates any need for written evaluation. Therefore, the objective has not been met at either unit. The evaluators would suggest that for the next year of the Project this objective be rewritten to stipulate either written or verbal feedback from the staff to the Project Director. They would also urge that the objective be expanded to include feedback from the Project Director to the staff, something which is equally important and which occurs frequently at each unit.

ADDITIONAL DATA ON TEACHERS

In this section, data which do not relate directly to the teacher objectives will be presented. Collection of such data were not called for in the evaluation design as set forth in the Addendum to Formal Proposal. Rather, the resident evaluators perceived the need for the collection of additional data and acted upon their perceptions.

Each of the two units, while comparable in many respects, is an autonomous entity, and hence may be characterized by phenomena peculiar to itself. Part of the job of the resident evaluators is to define and respond to the needs of their particular unit. Often these needs are not identical, and even when they seem to be very similar, the kinds of data requisite to an examination of the needs may differ between the schools. In this section, therefore, it will not always be possible to compare the two schools because the types of data collected are often very dissimilar in that the data were collected to meet very specific needs for each unit.

Student Evaluation of Teachers

At each unit, students and teachers recognized the need for some type of student evaluation of the staff. At the East Unit, all students were asked, during a pre-registration for next year's courses, to complete two instruments pertaining to such an evaluation: one instrument assessed the teachers' non-classroom behavior along thirteen dimensions, as well as his behavior as a counselor along four dimensions. The other instrument assessed the teachers' in-class performance. At the West Unit, students also completed two instruments, though each was markedly different from those completed at the East Unit. One of the instruments asked students to assess the quality of all of the courses which they had taken according to eleven separate dimensions. The other instrument asked students to briefly rate the individual teachers, largely in terms of the students' perceptions of whether or not they believed the teachers should be retained for the coming year. At each Unit, the instruments were largely developed by the students themselves, and therefore the dimensions which the students considered the most salient were included.

At the East Unit, the results of these instruments were analyzed by two members of the evaluation team and, with the concurrence of the faculty, were then made public to the school at large. One staff member, who questioned the legitimacy of the instruments, asked that his evaluations not be made public. At the West Unit, students analyzed the data in conjunction with the resident evaluator. Results from these instruments were not made public. Rather, each teacher was presented with only his own evaluation. Therefore, these data will not be included in this report as they are not in the possession of the evaluation team. The evaluators respect the desire of the West Unit's staff for confidentiality, and feel any attempt to have included the data contrary to their wishes would not have been appropriate.

Student Evaluation of East Unit Staff Non-Classroom Dimensions

The instrument used by the students to evaluate the non-classroom performance of the teachers at the East Unit consisted of a 17 question, forced choice questionnaire. On all questions students were to rate the teachers using a scale which ranged from a low of 1 to a high of 5. The first 13 questions were answered by all of the students as they pertained to the performance of every teacher as a member of the school community. The last 4 questions pertained to a teacher's performance as a counselor, and were completed only by students who had been a member of a specific teacher's counselling group. Table 5 summarizes the results of this questionnaire.

Table 5

Students' Ratings of Teachers' Non-Classroom Behavior

	Staff Mean	Range	No. of Staff above Mean
1. Teacher displays commitment to school.	4.1	3.2 to 4.6	5
2. Teacher acts in responsible way.	4.3	3.2 to 4.7	5
3. Teacher fulfills commitments and keeps promises.	3.9	2.9 to 4.7	4
4. Teacher is willing to talk to me.	4.0	2.8 to 4.6	10
5. Teacher values me as a person.	3.8	2.7 to 4.3	8
6. Teacher respects my opinion	3.6	2.7 to 4.3	10
7. Teacher plays an active part in decision making.	3.6	2.4 to 4.2	9
8. Teacher encourages me to be active in decision making.	3.2	2.2 to 4.3	8
9. Teacher displays concern for me.	3.4	2.5 to 4.0	10
10. Teacher is tolerant of diversity.	3.5	2.4 to 4.0	8
11. Teacher can accept criticism	3.5	2.4 to 3.9	8
12. Teacher provides leadership in effecting change.	3.6	2.9 to 4.4	8
13. Teacher works to facilitate smooth functioning of the school.	3.8	3.0 to 4.7	7
Rating of Performance as Counsellor			
1. Teacher provides effective academic counselling.	3.5	2.5 to 4.9	7
2. Teacher provides effective personal counseling.	3.5	2.8 to 5.0	5
3. Teacher meets regularly with task group.	2.7	1.0 to 4.5	8
4. Teacher keeps accurate student files.	4.1	2.6 to 4.8	5

Discussion

These data indicate that the students are in general positive about the non-classroom behavior of the full-time staff. In all but one case, that of meeting regularly with counselling groups, the mean for the entire staff is above 3 and in 4 cases it is 4 or above. The range for each dimension is usually about 1.4, though in the case of meeting regularly with the counselling group it is substantially higher at 3.5. The range in each dimension indicates, as may be expected, that some teachers are perceived as more effective in each dimension than others. It is further interesting to note the acute discrimination with which most students completed this questionnaire. That is, students did not tend to rate specific teachers "high" or "low" in all categories. In each case, all teachers were rated much higher in some categories than they were in others. No staff member, therefore, tended to raise the mean in all categories and, conversely, no single staff member tended to lower the mean in all categories.

In 11 of the 17 categories, the majority of the staff was above the mean. This indicates that, within these categories, a few staff members were perceived by the students as performing less than adequately. Again, however, the identity of these staff members differed from category to category, so that it is not valid to suppose that, in general, certain staff members were rated consistently lower across all categories than other staff members. Furthermore, the fairly high range for each category indicates that student perceptions of individual teachers were discrepant. Such differential ratings suggest that certain teachers were more "successful" with certain students than were other teachers. This is to be expected in any given school.

Conclusion: Students at the East Unit view the non-classroom performance of their teachers in a highly positive light for the most part. The major staff weakness indicated by the data is in the area of meeting regularly with counselling groups. It seems clear that about 50 percent of the staff did not meet with their groups on a regular basis.

Student Evaluation of Teachers at East Unit on Classroom Dimensions

Students were asked to rate all teachers, including the Project Director, on their classroom performance, along 15 different dimensions, using a scale ranging from 0 to 4. Unlike the scale used in the previous questionnaire, the numbers used in this scale are non-judgmental. Therefore, 0 does not necessarily connote a high rating in all categories nor does 4 indicate necessarily a high rating. Rather, the numbers themselves correspond to categories as follows: 0 means not at all; 1 means sometimes; 2 means about half the time; 3 means most of the time; and 4 means all the time.

The following table shows the mean rating for all except one of the full-time staff in each category, by students who have studied with the teacher for three or more cycles.

TABLE 6

STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHERS AT EAST

Dimensions	Teachers' Ratings*									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
licate how often you attended the class.	3.9	3.6	3.5	2.8	4.0	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.4
acher met with class on a regular basis.	3.9	3.7	3.2	3.1	3.0	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.7
acher accepted criticism and suggestions and was sensitive to my needs.	3.7	3.1	3.0	2.8	4.0	3.2	2.0	3.2	3.5	3.3
acher modified his teaching to meet my needs.	2.7	2.8	4.0	2.1	4.0	3.9	2.4	3.2	3.4	3.0
acher enabled me to learn in the way best suited to me.	3.1	3.5	4.0	2.5	3.7	3.2	2.4	3.4	3.6	3.4
acher presented the material in an interesting manner.	3.1	3.3	4.0	1.8	4.0	2.9	2.0	3.0	3.5	3.2
acher encouraged me to pursue the subject outside of class.	3.1	3.2	3.2	2.5	3.7	3.0	2.1	3.0	2.5	3.0
acher encouraged me to be an independent learner.	2.8	3.0	4.0	2.6	4.0	2.7	2.3	3.0	2.5	3.1
acher placed importance on the subject matter.	2.0	3.7	3.0	2.6	2.7	3.1	2.8	3.1	2.9	3.2
acher gave homework assignments.	3.2	1.8	2.5	2.8	3.3	2.3	2.6	1.7	2.3	2.2
acher required me to do the assignments.	2.6	2.6	2.0	2.0	3.7	2.2	2.6	2.4	2.9	2.2
acher required written work.	2.7	1.7	2.0	1.5	1.0	1.9	3.0	0.6	2.1	1.2
acher gave examinations or quizzes.	1.5	1.4	0.5	0.9	0.3	0.7	2.0	0.1	1.0	0.5
acher provided me with adequate feedback on my progress.	2.8	3.7	3.2	1.9	2.0	2.6	2.0	3.4	2.0	2.1
acher required me to give evidence of learning.	2.8	2.5	2.5	1.7	2.0	2.5	2.6	3.0	2.4	2.4

*Each teacher's numb

TABLE 6

STUDENT EVALUATION OF TEACHERS AT EAST

mensions	Teachers' Ratings*													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
attended the class.	3.9	3.6	3.5	2.8	4.0	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.9	3.8	2.3	3.5
on a regular basis.	3.9	3.7	3.2	3.1	3.0	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.4	3.8	2.6	3.7
ism and suggestions and was sensitive to my needs.	3.7	3.1	3.0	2.8	4.0	3.2	2.0	3.2	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.2	2.9	3.5
aching to meet my needs.	2.7	2.8	4.0	2.1	4.0	3.9	2.4	3.2	3.4	3.0	3.4	2.8	2.4	2.8
earn in the way best suited to me.	3.1	3.5	4.0	2.5	3.7	3.2	2.4	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.2	2.6	3.0
nterial in an interesting manner.	3.1	3.3	4.0	1.8	4.0	2.9	2.0	3.0	3.5	3.2	3.4	3.5	2.3	3.6
o pursue the subject outside of class.	3.1	3.2	3.2	2.5	3.7	3.0	2.1	3.0	2.5	3.0	3.0	3.2	2.3	3.2
o be an independent learner.	2.8	3.0	4.0	2.6	4.0	2.7	2.3	3.0	2.5	3.1	2.4	2.5	3.1	2.7
nce on the subject matter.	2.0	3.7	3.0	2.6	2.7	3.1	2.8	3.1	2.9	3.2	3.0	3.6	2.3	3.6
ssignments.	3.2	1.8	2.5	2.8	3.3	2.3	2.6	1.7	2.3	2.2	2.5	2.0	1.8	2.8
lo the assignments.	2.6	2.6	2.0	2.0	3.7	2.2	2.6	2.4	2.9	2.2	2.0	3.1	2.0	2.5
n work.	2.7	1.7	2.0	1.5	1.0	1.9	3.0	0.6	2.1	1.2	1.5	1.6	1.9	2.1
ns or quizzes.	1.5	1.4	0.5	0.9	0.3	0.7	2.0	0.1	1.0	0.5	0.0	2.6	0.4	0.5
h adequate feedback on my progress.	2.8	3.7	3.2	1.9	2.0	2.6	2.0	3.4	2.0	2.1	1.4	3.0	1.9	2.4
give evidence of learning.	2.8	2.5	2.5	1.7	2.0	2.5	2.6	3.0	2.4	2.4	1.6	3.1	1.8	2.7

*Each teacher's number

Discussion

It is almost impossible to make any substantive judgments regarding these data, for their meaning depends upon those aspects of classroom performance considered important by each individual teacher. For example, teacher 3 received a mean of only 0.5 in the category "teacher gave examinations or quizzes." Obviously, the teacher himself knows how often he gave examinations, and one can infer that perhaps he doesn't consider them to be very important. It is difficult to infer in some of these categories whether the students' judgments of teachers are essentially positive or negative because the mean ratings represent an attempt to describe the teachers' classroom performance.

The perceptions of the students can, however, be utilized to make descriptive statements about the classroom behavior of the teachers at the East Unit. On the basis of these perceptions the following descriptive statements seem warranted:

1. Both students and teachers attended class on a regular basis.

2. With few exceptions the students saw the teachers as being sensitive to the needs of individual students, to the extent that they modified teaching behaviors in an attempt to reach the students.

3. Teachers were generally successful in motivating the students to pursue subjects outside of the classroom; some teachers were more successful in this regard than others.

4. Most of the teachers did use homework assignments on a regular basis and required that the assignments be completed.

5. Most of the staff did not require much written work on the part of the students. This would seem inconsistent with the statement made above regarding homework assignments. Probably it reflects a tendency on the part of the staff to assign readings as homework assignments, and not written work.

6. None of the staff regularly used examinations or quizzes, yet a large majority provided what the students deemed adequate feedback on progress within the classroom. Since neither written work nor examinations were utilized with much frequency, one may infer that the feedback was largely based upon the verbal performance of the students.

7. Most of the teachers required students to give evidence of their learning. Again, since neither examinations nor written work were extensively utilized, it is probable that students were required to present oral evidence.

Conclusion

The evaluators believe that the willingness of the teachers to undergo such extensive student evaluation and to have such results made public is commendable. It indicates, on the part of the East Unit staff, a willingness openly to share teaching problems and a concomitant loss of the self-consciousness in relation to classroom behavior which often characterizes teachers in most schools.

Next year's evaluation should provide opportunity to corroborate many of the students' perceptions, and should begin to supply data relating to the

quality of the teaching behaviors.

Staff Perceptions of Positive and Negative Aspects of the Schools

As a part of the second round of staff interviews, each staff member was asked to list the most positive and negative aspects of the school as he perceived them.

In relation to the Interim Evaluation Report, most of the positive dimensions mentioned by the staff members at each unit recurred during the second round of staff interviews. In particular, the following aspects were stressed by a majority of each staff:

> Flexibility of the school in regard to personal needs
>
> Sense of individual initiative and responsibility strengthened
>
> Fulfilling relationships with both students and other staff
>
> Feelings of competence and success as a teacher were strengthened.
>
> Ability to make and/or participate in every level of decision-making in the school.

The dimensions cited above are to be expected, given the positive feelings that most teachers have about teaching in the Alternative Schools Project. Data pertaining to these feelings have been previously presented and discussed.

In terms of their perceptions of the negative aspects of the schools, the two staffs offer markedly different perceptions. For the staff at the West Unit, the following negative aspects of the school were mentioned:

> Overextension of effort--fatigue
>
> Feeling of isolation from certain staff members
>
> Conflicting role demands of teacher, counsellor and administrator ... teaching priorities sometimes suffer as a result of time-consuming administrative tasks.
>
> Feelings of existing inequalities among staff members

It is important to note that, although at least three staff members mentioned each of the negative aspects listed above, none, except the first item, characterize the feelings of the majority of the staff. Also important is the fact that

certain negative aspects mentioned in the Interim Report such as "don't know colleagues personally" and "frustration of non-decision-making," have either ceased to be concerns or have been superseded by other aspects considered more important.

At the East Unit, the staff noted the following major weaknesses of the school:

Inefficiency of daily operations

Failure of staff to function well

Failure to develop trusting relationships

Counselling groups have been a failure

Too much emphasis on credit

Failure to be innovative and creative

A lack of meaningful learning within the school

Failure of intensive learning weeks

With the exception of the second statement, these feelings were not cited by a majority of the staff, and were in fact mentioned by only three or four people. It is evident in comparing the negative aspects mentioned by the staff at the West Unit to those cited by staff members at the East Unit, that the latter are decidedly more critical of themselves. Members of the West Unit's staff tended to criticize certain institutional aspects of their role such as fatigue or role-conflict situations. Staff members at the East Unit seemed, in some instances, to concentrate on the failure of staff members in attaining certain ideals, such as being truly innovative and creative, to function well, or to develop trusting relationships.

It must be remembered that in the case of both units, the majority of the staff could not agree upon the negative features of the Project. Any attempt to read particular significance in discrepancies between the two schools is probably spurious, since the staff members themselves, at each unit, could not agree.

Part III

COMMUNITY OBJECTIVE: BY JUNE, 1972, AT LEAST SEVENTY-FIVE PERCENT OF THE PARENTS WILL EXPRESS A POSITIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD THE SCHOOL. AT LEAST SIXTY PERCENT OF THE PEOPLE LOCATED IN THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITY, BUT NOT DIRECTLY INVOLVED WITH THE SCHOOL, WILL INDICATE A POSITIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD THE SCHOOL.

Only that part of the objective dealing with parental attitudes toward the Alternative Schools Project was assessed during the past year. The evaluators were unable to clarify the meaning of the term "surrounding community" and lacking a definition could not begin to assess that aspect of the objective.

Parental attitudes were assessed through the use of a telephone interview, conducted during May, 1972, with a random sample of parents from each school. At the West Unit, the sample size was twenty-five, which represented about twenty-two percent of the parents with children in the school. At the East Unit the sample was composed of thirty-nine parents, representing about twenty-three percent of the parents at that school. No effort was made to stratify the sample for race, grade or sex. All parents were asked the following three questions;

1. "How do you feel about your child's experience in the Alternative School? Comment on both academic and personal growth."
2. "What are the three major weaknesses of the school?"
3. "What are the three major strengths of the school?"

Responses to the first question provide sufficient data to determine whether the schools met the first part of the objective. The following charts illustrate parental responses to the first interview question.

Table 1

Parental Attitudes Toward Academic Growth

	East	West
Basically positive	18%	52%
Mixed positive and negative	39%	24%
Basically negative	25%	8%
No basis for judgment	18%	16%

Table 2

Parental Attitude Toward Personal Growth

	East	West
Positive attitude	64%	76%
Mixed positive and negative attitude	18%	8%
Negative attitude	8%	0%
No basis for judgment	10%	16%

Discussion

The tables reveal some interesting differences in attitude between parents of students at the West Unit and those of students in the East Unit. In the case of both Academic and Personal growth the parents from the West Unit are distinctly more positive than their counterparts at the East Unit. The discrepancy is particularly large in attitudes regarding academic growth, with a substantial majority of the parents of the West Unit expressing positive attitudes about such growth and a small minority of the East parents responding in similar fashion. It is highly likely that the discrepancy in parental

attitudes here mirrors the discrepancy in student attitudes between the two schools concerning teachers and courses, which has been previously cited.

Conclusion

For the objective to be met, 75 percent of the parents would have had to express positive attitudes in both the area of academic growth and the area of personal growth. Therefore, the objective was met at neither of the units. The West Unit, however, came much closer to achieving success in meeting the objective than did the East Unit. In fact, the difference between West Unit's failure to meet the objective and success amounted to only 6 parental responses. That is, 6 additional affirmative responses would have satisfied the criterion level of 75 percent stipulated in the objective.

Additional Data on Parental Attitudes

As was indicated, parents were also asked during the interview to list the major strengths and weaknesses of the two units as they perceived them. The responses from the parents of the East Unit, in regard to the major weaknesses of the school are especially revealing, in that they provide a rationale for the generally mixed to negative attitudes regarding academic growth.

At the East Unit, 26 percent of those parents interviewed cited a lack of effective communication with parents as a major weakness of the school. Several specifically mentioned a lack of information in regard to their sons' or daughters' academic progress. Only 8 percent of the parents interviewed at the West Unit voiced a complaint pertaining to communication problems. Furthermore, 23 percent of the parents interviewed at the East Unit felt that the school did not make sufficient academic demands upon the students, while no parents from the West Unit cited this as a weakness. In addition, 15 percent of the parents at the East Unit criticized the school for not placing enough stress on academic subjects. None of the parents from the West Unit cited this as a weakness

characterizing their school. Fifteen percent of the parents from the East Unit criticized the school for lack of structure and organization while none of the parents from the West Unit cited this as a weak point of the school. Finally, 12 percent of the parents from the East Unit cited inadequacies in the basic skill areas, as did 12 percent of the parents at the West Unit.

Other criticisms offered by the parents of students in the East Unit included feelings that the mathematics program was inadequate, that the English program was inadequate, and that some of the teachers were immature. These last few criticisms, however, were voiced by only 9 percent of the parents.

At the West Unit, criticisms of the school tended to be diffuse, and were cited by only 2 or 3 parents. One exception to this tendency was a criticism cited by 7 parents, or 21 percent, that students were being given too much freedom and not enough responsibility. The other criticisms, cited by at least 3 parents, are as follows: ineffective intensive learning weeks; student involvement in decision making which takes away valuable class time; inadequate courses in mathematics and science; inadequate counselling; a grading system which is too subjective; poor records in relation to attendance; lack of involvement of the Director in the total school process.

The areas of the schools' strengths cited by the parents are also interesting in that they are widely discrepant between the two schools. At the East Unit, 51 percent of the parents cited student involvement in decision making as a strength of the school, only 12 percent of the parents from the West Unit cited this as a strength. The belief that the school makes the students happy, and the area of student-teacher relationships, were cited by 18 percent of the parents at the East Unit, while none of the parents at the West Unit cited the issue of student happiness. As at the East Unit, however, 18 percent of the parents at the West Unit cited the area of student-teacher relationships.

At the West Unit, 24 percent of the parents highlighted the wide range of subjects offered to students; 21 percent the quality of the staff, the improve-

ment in students' self-concept and the open structure of the school, while none of these areas were mentioned by parents of students at the East Unit.

The remainder of the strengths cited by parents at each school were mentioned only by 3 or 4 parents. They are as follows: West Unit--quality of teaching; small class size; sense of community; individualized learning responsibilities; student-student relationships; student responsibility is encouraged; flexible scheduling; and courses in English and Social Studies. East Unit--the school provides a place for non-conformists to be productive; the Project Director; the humane atmosphere; the school makes it easier to deal with the child at home; the spirit of innovation.

Although they do have criticisms, parents of the West Unit seem more satisfied with the general academic atmosphere of their school than do the parents at the East Unit. As has been previously stated, the same discrepancy in attitude has been expressed by the students from each of the two schools.

STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE ALTERNATIVE SCHOOL

To determine the attitudes of Alternative School students toward several areas of the Project, an attitude questionnaire was administered to the interview sample in both units in May, 1972. An identical questionnaire was also administered to a control group comprised of students who had acted as part of the control group for the Stanford Achievement Tests.

The questionnaire consisted of two parts: Part 1 was a set of 35 descriptive statements to which the students were asked to respond whether each was "like my school," "somewhat like my school," or "unlike my school." The list included both positive and negative statements to offset problems of response set. Part 2 consisted of 4 evaluative statements, also worded positively and negatively. Students were asked whether they agreed, disagreed, or were unsure about their feelings with regard to each item. All responses which were favorable to the school, regardless of the positive or negative wording of the statements, were assigned a score of 3; responses least favorable to the school were assigned a score of 1; and responses such as "uncertain" or "somewhat like my school," were assigned a score of 2.

The 39 items were clustered into 9 subscales each of which refers to a particular content area or aspect of the school. The 9 areas are: teachers; student decision making; social concerns; course evaluations; general affect or morale; student relations; learning; equality of opportunity; and the evaluative section as previously discussed.

The scores for each of the 3 groups of students were tested for significance in each of the 9 subscales, using analysis of variance. The table below presents the results of the analysis of variance for each subscale across all 3 groups. The total number of students in each group is as follows: East Unit--30 students; West Unit--21 students; Control Group--18 students. The number enclosed within parentheses immediately under the mean represents the standard deviation for subscale for each group.

Table 1

Average Scores per Student per Item and Standard Deviations of Item Scores plus F Ratios for Analysis of Variance

Scale	East	West	Control	F ratio*
1. Teachers	2.53 (.121)	2.82 (.035)	1.86 (.099)	41.76**
2. Student decision making	2.36 (.244)	2.70 (.253)	1.79 (.330)	14.81**
3. Social concern	2.45 (.156)	2.64 (.253)	1.94 (.330)	8.70**
4. Course evaluations	2.21 (.233)	2.60 (.098)	1.85 (.200)	11.77**
5. Affective concerns	2.22 (.104)	2.39 (.152)	1.67 (.120)	17.69**
6. Student relations	2.04 (.176)	2.32 (.282)	1.65 (.118)	8.99**
7. Learning	2.25 (.137)	2.16 (.150)	1.72 (.137)	8.73**
8. Equality of opportunity	2.01 (.152)	1.97 (.278)	1.68 (.360)	2.03
9. Evaluative items	2.65 (.086)	2.73 (.222)	1.71 (.238)	29.51**

*The critical F ratio in this case was 3.14 so any F ratio above this number is significant at at least the .05 level.

*Significant at the .05 level.

Discussion

The table indicates significant differences in 8 of the 9 subscales. It does not present a clear indication of which groups differed from the others. In other words, it does not show the direction of the significant differences. It is efficacious at this point to discuss each of the subscales separately, indicating where the differences between the groups lay.

Subscale 1-Attitudes Toward Teachers

In this subscale, consisting of 5 items, students were asked to respond to such statements as: "There are many students in this school who teachers don't think can learn very much," and "Most teachers here are genuinely concerned about students' feelings."

The analysis of variance revealed that the students at the West Unit have significantly more positive attitudes about their teachers than students at the East Unit; that students in each of the two Units have more positive attitudes about their teachers than do students in the control group. While it is tempting to speculate upon the reasons underlying the significant difference between the East and West Units on this subscale, any attempt to do so would be highly misleading as the evaluators have no data relating to such a difference.

Subscale 2--Student Decision Making

This subscale consisted of 3 items such as the following: "Students hesitate to speak out when they think something is wrong in this school," and "Students in this school have a large say when decisions are made about the way the school is run."

The analysis of variance revealed that while there are no significant differences here between the East and West Units, both units differ significantly from the control group. That is, students at the Alternative Schools Project indicate a much higher involvement in decision making at their school than do comparable students from the sending schools. Given the great emphasis placed upon student involvement in the decision-making process at the Alternative Schools Project, the difference between the students at the Alternative School and those in the control group is to be expected.

Subscale 3--Social Concerns

This two-item subscale consisted of statements like the following: "Around

this school, there are many students who are interested in the problems of society and are trying to help solve them."

As was the case above, the analysis of variance revealed no differences between the two Alternative School units, but revealed a significant difference between the students of the Alternative Schools and students from the sending schools. The Alternative School students saw their peers and themselves involved to a greater extent in social problems than did students in the control group. Since the Alternative Schools encourage their students to become involved with fieldwork activities directly related to social problems, the fact that such a difference exists is not surprising.

Subscale 4--Course Evaluation

This three-item subscale called for students to evaluate the quality of the courses which they had taken in their school. Students responded to the following types of statements: "Class discussions in this school are often exciting with a lot of active student participation," and "In most courses in this school, you really get a lot accomplished."

As was the case with Subscale 1, the analysis of variance revealed that students in the West Unit are significantly more positive about their courses than are students at the East Unit; that students in both units are significantly more positive than students in the control group. The difference between the East and West Units is consistent with the difference illustrated in Subscale 1, which demonstrated that students at the West Unit are more positive about their teachers than are students at the East Unit. Again, as was the case with Subscale 1, the evaluators have no data which would explain the differences between the East and West Units on this subscale. The differences between the Alternative School students and those in the control group may stem from the close rapport between teachers and students at the Alternative School. It may also indicate that teachers in the two Alternative School Units have been suc-

cessful in implementing new teaching strategies, and, as previous data have indicated, in using teaching behaviors appropriate to the needs of their students.

Subscale 5--Affective Concerns

This subscale consisted of 6 items such as "This school is so dull that many students loaf around or get into trouble because they are bored," and "There is considerable dissatisfaction with what's happening in this school."

The analysis of variance revealed no significant difference between the East and West Units on this subscale, but did find a significant difference between the students at each of the Alternative School Units and students at the control group. This would indicate that, in general, students at the Alternative Schools Project are more content with the overall school gestalt than are students in the control group. The Alternative Schools, then, have been successful in inculcating within their students a sense of commitment to the schools which supersedes the level of commitment of the students in the control group.

Subscale 6--Student Relations

This three-item subscale asked students to respond to statements like "At this school kids from various social and racial backgrounds seem to respect each other and get along pretty well," and "Most students in this school try to be friendly and are willing to help each other."

Analysis of variance revealed no significant differences between the East and West Units on this subscale. It did, however, indicate that both the East and West Units are significantly different from the students in the control group. This would appear to mean that students in the Alternative Schools perceive less friction and more amiability among students than do the students in the control group. This finding is consistent with the greater commitment expressed by the

students in the Alternative Schools, as mentioned above. The difference between the Alternative School students and the students in the control group is probably also attributable to the discrepant emphases on competition between the Alternative Schools and the parent high schools. Since competition is clearly de-emphasized in the Alternative Schools, students need not perceive each other as threatening.

Subscale 7--Learning

This subscale consisted of 7 items such as "Students in this school are usually encouraged to make up their own minds about a problem, rather than told what to think about it," and "In this school most kids are interested in learning for its own sake rather than in getting grades or credits."

While the East and West Units were found to differ significantly from the control group, analysis of variance revealed no significant differences between the units. Therefore, students in the Alternative Schools tend, in general, to be more positive about their learning experiences than do students in the control group. Students from the Alternative School feel not only that their learning is of a higher quality, but that learning exists for its own sake, and not for the awarding of credits and grades. The latter is consistent with the general lack of a competitive atmosphere in the Alternative Schools as described earlier.

Subscale 8--Equality of Opportunity

This subscale consisted of 3 items. Students were asked to respond to statements like "Students at this school all basically have the same chance to get something out of it," or "Certain students in this school have more influence than others."

The analysis of variance reveals no significant differences among any of the 3 groups, although the table illustrates that the means among the groups differ slightly. The lack of significant differences indicates that students

from all three groups perceive a general equality of educational opportunity within their schools. However, since students from the Alternative School differed from students in the control group on Subscale 2, student involvement in decision making, it may be that the Alternative School students meant something different in their responses to this subscale than did the students from the control group. It is plausible that in terms of equality of opportunity, the Alternative School students meant to indicate that everyone in the school has an equal opportunity to influence school policy and various decisions. While students in the control group may have meant that, in general, students are equally lacking in influence. If this be the case, which is highly speculative, then Alternative School students may have intended their answers to be positive in nature, while students from the control group, given the fact that they had heretofore responded negatively to the statements on student influence, may have been responding in a negative vein.

Subscale 9--Evaluative Items

This last subscale consisted of 4 items and asked students to evaluate their overall feelings toward their school. The itmes within the subscale are as follows: "If I could I would choose to go to a different school than the one I now attend"; "In general I am pleased with the way school has been going for me this year"; "I am pretty dissatisfied with what I've learned in school this year"; and "In general I am much more satisfied with school this year than I was last year."

The analysis of variance revealed no significant differences between the East and West Units, but did reveal a significant difference between the two Alternative School Units and the control group. This would indicate that the students in the Alternative Schools are in general more satisfied with the schools and themselves in relation to the schools than are the students in the control group.

Drawing Conclusions from these Data

The data gleaned from the attitude questionnaires seem, in all but one case wherein no significant differences were found, to favor the Alternative Schools. While this may in fact be the case, the evaluators urge the reader to be extremely cautious in interpreting these results.

The questionnaire is comprised of statements which embody the values inherent in the Alternative Schools Project. It may be that these values are not always congruent with those intrinsic to the sending high schools. If this be the case, students from the Alternative Schools would tend to respond more positively to items in the questionnaire than would the students in the sending schools. For example, the value of involving students within the decision-making process is not only strongly emphasized at the Alternative Schools, but is explicitly affirmed in the objectives for the school. The total institution is, therefore, committed to serving this ideal. It is not at all clear that the sending high schools espouse the same ideal in regard to student involvement in decision making. What is true about this differential emphasis may be true in other areas as well. Therefore, it may be that this questionnaire illustrates a difference in institutional values between the Alternative Schools Project and the sending schools, but does not reveal in any absolute sense substantive differences in educational quality between the two sets of institutions.

The control group used for comparative purposes in this survey consisted of students from the sending schools who volunteered for the Alternative Schools Project, but who were not selected in the lottery. It is reasonable to assume that these students are among the more dissatisfied students in each of the sending schools. The results from the control group, therefore, should not be interpreted as being representative of all students in the sending high schools, but only of perceptions of students who may represent a dissatisfied element within these schools.

PART V

Major Conclusions and Recommendations

The thrust of the data, although not consistent in all respects, supports the following major conclusions:

1. The Alternative Schools enjoyed a very successful first year--a complex educational plan was developed, implemented, modified, and problems tentatively defined for resolution in the future.

2. Few schools in the United States have cooperated so fully in permitting a comprehensive, outside "look" at their work. This lack of institutional complacency is itself exemplary and transcends any simple tally of objectives met or not met.

3. The impact of the school on such subtle educational outcomes as attitudes and values toward the self and toward learning has been positive and of great magnitude. When contrasted with the indifference of most standard schools toward affective outcomes, this achievement is all the more commendable.

4. Although parental perceptions of strengths and weaknesses varied between the two units, the number of parents holding a clearly negative view of the school's work was small.

5. Teachers' attitudes were very positive; they felt that they had more autonomy, a better personal-social climate in which to teach, and a greater sense of competency. Teacher attitudes were generally positive at the beginning of the year and maintained this high positive level throughout the year.

6. Teacher methods (discussion, tutoring, field work, independent study, little lecturing) and instructional materials (teacher developed materials, selected paperbacks, and Xeroxed copies of special material) indicate a clear concern for students, an effort to individualize instruction, and a large capacity for work--and are of no little moment in eliciting the positive student reactions recorded throughout this report.

The methods and materials employed here contrast sharply with those employed in standard schools.

7. In the two academic areas tested, the control group was favored in mathematics and reading. Other areas of achievement might well be measured in the future employing tests which reflect the instructional objectives of the teachers thus giving more content validity to the tests used.

8. Student perceptions of the teachers at East revealed a clear professional image--responsible, concerned with students, open, and willing to modify teaching behaviors to the needs of students. (Only data from East were made public.)

9. There are incipient problems, too. The problems might be stated this way:

(1) How can the school establish the requisite intellectual rigor and proper structure for students to learn in those situations where these elements are appropriate?

(2) How best can the delicate balance between individual and group freedom and individual and group responsibility be established? How can the quality of student participation in decision-making be improved?

(3) How can these solutions be reached within a humanistic educational philosophy?

Other problems, although less clear than those cited above, relate to improving systematically the quality of the teaching, improving the organizational structures which are essential to achieve the school's objectives, and, possibly, enrichment of the curriculum in some of the areas cited by students such as music, commercial subjects, and physical education.

Although the school's openness is one of its unique qualities, there is always the danger in any social experiment that the experimenters will slowly close themselves to criticism and to the experience of others. I can think of no better antidote than student and staff discussion of the criticism of progressive schools that John Dewey made in his classic book Experience and Education. In the final analysis, few men are as reactionary as the dogmatic progressive.

RAG